

## The Freemason Society

M. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

*From the "Irish Theological Quarterly."*

**I**N the Home Rule bill—which has had the embarrassing experience of being denounced by those who, if it were true to its name, would have been its friends, and lauded by those who, in the same circumstances, would have been its enemies—we note that elaborate care is taken to make special friendly provision for the Freemason Society. If secret societies are condemned by the Church, if this particular sect—the model for countless others and the most notorious of all—is subject to one of her severest censures, surely the attempt to exempt it from the control of ordinary law is the most cynical act in the new-found process of allowing some measures of justice to a Catholic nation.

Not that we hold the Freemasons of these countries guilty of the abominations perpetrated by their confreres in other lands. The Anglo-Saxon Masons, as they came first in history, so also are among the first in their belief and practice—the least censurable of a censurable class. While others wandered far afield, *they* have kept close to the ancient landmarks.

Strange how human societies develop. Time was when one might have been pardoned for predicting that the society of "Masons"—and among them the superior men were classed as "Free" masons—would prove in time one of the strongest bulwarks of the Catholic Church. For they constituted one of the medieval gilds, that embodied much better than any of our modern "unions" the Church's principles on labor and capital, and that have come into fame again in our discussions on the social problem. The "Reformation" came, and the gilds as a whole disappeared. Some, though, lingered on in a weakened condition, and among these were the Masons: their members used to meet in the London taverns: and, in 1717, it struck the leaders that they might do worse than take the disorganized clubs in hand and reorganize them for social purposes—good-fellowship and con-

viviality. And so, on St. John's Day, June 24, the first Grand Lodge was established.

The Masons, we know, are not pleased with their humble origin. Their imaginative writers have traced the Society back to many worthy men—including the Knights Templars, Pythagoras, Euclid, Noah, Adam—and even beyond that to the celestial forces of stellar space; and many of the simple, earnest "brothers" still look askance at the learned members of their body who classify these flattering tales as "legends." But, pale and prosaic as the truth really is, the Masons may find consolation in their subsequent history. They came out of the taverns in 1721, and then they got the recognition and approval that made them famous—or infamous. They were patronized by distinguished men, as the guilds had been: several members of the Royal Society of England, recognizing perhaps the family tie between their own mathematical principles and those of the higher branches of architectural masonry, sought and secured membership in the new society. That gave them courage and self-confidence. They remembered the old Catholic rules or "charges" of the guilds, and drew up their own "Constitutions"—modeled on the old, but modified to suit the change that had come since England and the guilds were Catholic. The most important articles are the first and the sixth. The latter forbids interference in politics—and history tells how it has been disobeyed: the former assures us, among other things, that "[a Mason], if he rightly understands the art, will never be a stupid atheist or an irreligious libertine"—an ambiguous statement, as the sequel shows.

#### THE SCOTTISH RITE.

Their subsequent career is written large in history. In England a rival Order—the "Ancient York"—sprang up in 1751: but a union was effected in 1813, and the Society has continued since in the form in which we know it. It was introduced into France about 1730. The need of an ancient parentage was felt. So the story spread that the English had lost the esoteric lore handed down from the sages of the past, but that the Scotch had kept it: and the so-called "Scottish" rite was the result. The Templars, according to one account, were the real founders:

and, as *they* were associated in the popular mind with various kinds of magic and necromancy, all the weird formulæ and elaborate foolery of the Kabalists found an easy entry and still marks the Society's literature. With many feuds between rival sections, it spread into the Latin countries on the one hand—where the extreme lodges are known as "Grand Orients"—and, on the other, into Germany, Austria, Russia and Turkey. Similar developments have marked its progress in America. It came in 1730: and the feuds between the "Ancients" and the "Moderns" made themselves specially felt during the War of Independence, though a union was effected later. In opposition to both, as in England and France, another "ancient" society appeared, taking its name again from Scotland—the "Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite." It embraces two "Jurisdictions," the Northern and the Southern, has branches in some thirty different countries, and, among English-speaking people, claims first notice—from friend and foe alike.

There is no central authority exercising jurisdiction over the various branches. They are independent, and so, practically speaking, are the Grand Lodges. But there is a unity of spirit—as is amply proved by the letters exchanged and by such well-known facts as the world-wide protests when the Spanish anarchist Ferrer met his death some years ago. Unity of doctrine there is none; but it may be said that the two truths originally insisted upon as the minimum—God's existence, and the immortality of the soul—have gradually come to be regarded as the only two essential to *any* form of religion: all others, and even these except in an attenuated form, are mere human devices, liable to separate men instead of uniting them. And, in the line of departure from ancient standards, it is possible to arrange the five great sections in a downward scale.

First come the Freemasons of these islands. The Christian tone has never been lost, and the efforts to set up the society as a rival to Christianity have been few and short-lived. The average view of the members is just that of the Protestant community to which they happen to belong. This is due in part to the fact that Protestant ministers have all through been prominent among its

members; and perhaps, too, to the other fact, surprising to us now, that down till the beginning of the last century Catholics were openly enrolled. The organization is, in the main, social and philanthropic; but the pressure it exerts, in secular matters, in favor of its own members is too extreme and notorious to be defended, or doubted, by any impartial outsider. Added to this is the more damning fact that it is a secret society that binds its members to obedience to unknown leaders, and that, by refusing to protest against the actions done in the name of Masonry elsewhere, it lays itself open to the charge of complicity. And so the Church's attitude toward it becomes intelligible.

#### THE AMERICAN MASONS.

Next, and practically on the same level, come the ordinary American Masons. Their published work reads often like Catholic sermons, though it covers a rather limited field. Their attitude toward their Catholic neighbors "ranges from indifference to positive friendliness." By their advanced confreres they are regarded as useless brethren, afraid to put their principles into practice out of a craven respect for the slavish spirit of their surroundings. They are like suburban residents that board an express, beam on their neighbors when they find it going at lightning speed, congratulate themselves and everyone else, and then start up in dismay when they find it not stopping at their own village, and make frantic efforts to throw themselves out and crawl home to peace and safety.

Their nearest neighbors in the train are the members of the "Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite." *They* have no fear of the distant places it may carry them to. The Masonic religion is enough for them. A belief in God—yes, but in the Masonic God, not the anthropomorphic creation of the Christian. If they are called atheists, what care they? They "rightly understand the art" and cannot at least be called "stupid." Morality, too, they accept—but, again, the Masonic morality, every statement prefixed with a symbol that gives a special, often a sexual, meaning to an apparently orthodox principle. Some points in the Catholic Church they admire—its social

work and the unselfish lives of so many of its members. But, as an institution, they mark it down for venomous attack as the enemy of the human mind and the arch-apostle of slavery.

And, side by side with them in the train, sit the members of the German Rite. With the Lutheran wing of Christianity they are just on speaking terms; other sections, Catholics included, they treat with abuse and contempt. Their religion is Rationalism, their God the World-Soul, their morality just that of the pagan world. And in the front row of carriages you will find the Latins, all of them—especially the members of the Grand Orient—quite delighted with the pace. These were the men that the Popes had specially in view when they condemned the Society as a dangerous force, the embodied spirit of Rationalism, subversive of all supernatural religion, an enemy to Church and State. The Masonic G.A.O.T.U. (Great Architect of the Universe), understood as Masons may understand him, might, one would think, be accepted by anyone. But not by *these*; relying, we presume, on the Masonic principle that they were not "stupid" atheists, they abolished the symbol in 1876, and have faced with a smile the qualified protests of their brethren in other countries. They have been revolutionary from the first; planned the horrors in France and Portugal and Mexico; assured the poor benighted Christian that "there were no realities behind those clouds" and that "the lights of Heaven were extinguished," and proclaimed themselves, in word and action, the all-round enemies of the Christian creed.

#### FREEMASONRY'S INFLUENCE.

The influence of Freemasonry? Undoubtedly very great. Their number is less than is generally supposed—the best authorities put it as low as two millions. But, then, they form the stem from which the vast majority of the secret societies of the present day spring. And, when we remember that, in America for instance, there are over 600 of these societies, largely formed on the Masonic model and carrying to their natural developments the lessons learned by their prominent members in the Lodges, we may form some idea of the immense pressure the Society exerts on the public opinion of the country.

Secrets? Well, there are secrets, of course, of a certain class. Secrets about practical policy in a special crisis—every secret society has got *them*, and Masonry is no exception. Secrets about general aims, such as are carefully hidden from the “knife and fork” members of the blue degrees—but to any diligent student of history they are an open book. Secrets, too, that (as one of their own authorities puts it) “are only beginning to be understood, and can never really be communicated because a man could not understand them if he did not find them out for himself”—the Kabalistic interpretations of the Bible would rank among them. All these the Masons have, everyone admits. But secrets in the sense of special knowledge, held by the Masons and unknown to the rest of mankind? The world is getting tired of that nonsense. Where would the Masons have got them? In the taverns of London? Or in pagan literature? Or in the writings or special revelations of Masons themselves? In an age when every discoverer is only too anxious to let the world know of his genius, the claim put forward by middle-class men of the Freemason type to the exclusive possession of esoteric lore is too absurd for discussion. One authority talks in mysterious language of some hidden doctrine that no “cowan” should be allowed to hear of; another, generally a Continental—the bad boy of Masonry—lets out the secret; the public investigates the matter, only to discover that it is some hoary platitude, published by Masonry long ago and despised and neglected by the world ever since.

But, for all that, the Society—with its secret methods, its firm grip on the members of the low degrees, its developed irreligious views wherever religion has to be faced in earnest, its unity of spirit and powers of concentration in a crisis—is one of the most dangerous forces that can confront legitimate rulers in Church or State. That is why we protest against the attempt to give it a privilege position in this Catholic land [Ireland]—even though the attempt is made in the murky atmosphere that has gathered round a doomed and distorted bill.

## The Church's Remedies for Class Warfare

PETER FINLAY, S.J.

*From the "Irish Catholic."*

WITH Catholic labor unions, under Catholic leaders, and guided by Catholic principles, with labor sharing in the management of the work in which it is engaged, with co-operation between employers and employed and between the employed themselves, with the acceptance by capital and by labor of conciliation boards, to which both may have recourse, and with the due representation of Labor on public bodies, we have very important means for preventing the outbreak of war between class and class, and for restoring peace, if war should have already broken out. And the Catholic Church makes no objection; she approves and recommends all these various means. She does more: she preaches the spirit which alone can vivify them.

She tells us that "It is impossible to reduce civil society to one dead level. Socialists may do their utmost; but all striving against nature is in vain. There naturally exist among mankind manifold differences of the most important kind: men differ in capacity, skill, health, strength; and unequal fortune is a necessary result of unequal conditions." The result may be averted, where small groups of men voluntarily embrace the Gospel counsels; as in the Religious Orders of the Catholic Church; and where small civil societies are in the earlier stages of development, and are organized after the pattern of the Religious Orders, and cut off from social intercourse with the larger world outside, such were the Paraguay Reductions. But these are exceptions—perhaps the only known exceptions—to that natural law which we have just quoted from Leo XIII.: Men are born into very unequal conditions, and the more favored will not forego generally and for long the advantages which the inequality offers to them. They will aim at and obtain positions of authority in the State. They will possess themselves of the easiest and most honor-



able employments. They will dominate the local bodies to which they belong. They will acquire themselves, they will provide for their children, the best education within their reach. Is it to be expected that they will rest content with the same remuneration for their labor as the least intelligent, least energetic of their fellow-citizens. That they will be satisfied to work strenuously in producing wealth, and yet look for no larger share in it than others who, from choice or inability, work little or not at all? The mass of human nature, as all experience goes to show, will not "supply labor power" to the community on such terms.

Hence, Holy Scripture never even suggests a condition of society in which there shall be no inequalities of fortune. It is nowhere put before us as desirable or as possible. Men's souls are all of equal value before God, redeemed at the same price, intended for the same blessedness. But the underlying assumption of both Old and New Testaments is that man's earthly life will continue always what it was when the Scriptures were written, will be always marked by the contrast between poverty and riches. The Divine legislation against theft and covetousness, the praise of almsgiving, the condemnation of all who oppress the poor, the obligation to pay the laborer his hire: the whole context of Scripture points to an ideal earthly state which God calls on men to strive after; but it is not one assuredly from which poverty, and sufferings, and the contrasts of want and plenty are shut out. Our Lord Himself has no vision of a world such as Socialists would create. "Then shall the King say to them that shall be on his right hand: . . . I was hungry and you gave Me to eat; I was thirsty and you gave Me to drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in, naked and you covered Me. . . . Amen, I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these My least brethren, you did it unto Me." Plainly, Our Lord thinks that there will be those who hunger, and thirst, and are naked, until the end of time. He looked forward to no Socialist utopia.

Nor would He have us strive for it anxiously. Christian charity will lead us, as Our Lord implies in the passage just quoted, to assist those who stand in need of



our assistance; but not as though we could re-create an earthly paradise, or as though it matters greatly when we fail. Our most important interests are not here. The present is a mere beginning of life. "As for riches and the other things which men call good and desirable, whether we now have them in abundance or lack them altogether—so far as eternal happiness is concerned—matters little; the vital thing is to use them aright." Men whose minds are fixed habitually upon the life to come, whose hearts are "in the good things which God hath prepared for those who love Him," are not likely to over-value earthly blessings, either for themselves or others, or to seek after them by means which God condemns. And, if it be said, as it often is said, that revealed religion is at variance with the interests of the poor and of the workers, that it transfers their highest hopes and efforts to another world and bids them be content with intolerable conditions in this, we answer that, even were it so, Christ's teachings would still be the supreme rule of conduct for all Christian men; that we may not, as a class, any more than as individuals, set that rule aside. Further, we admit that, in a world such as ours, to adopt Christ's teachings as a standard of judgment and of conduct, is to put ourselves at a disadvantage in the competition for earthly success. Rather, Our Lord warns His followers: "The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke up the Word"; "The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light"; "In the world you shall have tribulation"; "If they have persecuted Me, so also will they persecute you"; "Blessed are ye poor, for yours is the Kingdom of God," and so on, in passage after passage. And it must be so while the great majority of mankind reject the Gospel of Christ, or accept it only as a system of belief, which is not to govern the world of politics, finance, and industry.

#### CHRISTIAN LAW OF JUSTICE.

But, though Catholic teaching suggests that class distinctions can never be abolished in a stable and progressive commonwealth, that there will be always poor and rich, employers and employed, Catholic teaching

does also tend powerfully to bridge over the difference between class and class, to allay the feeling of enmity and suspicion which each now entertains towards the other.

For the Church teaches the doctrine of justice as binding equally on every class in the community. And not merely the justice which safeguards private property, and prohibits theft of what another lawfully possesses; but justice in its wider and more usual sense, which bids us give to others what they have a rightful claim to, whatever the foundation on which the claim may rest. It is this justice which demands that contracts between employers and employed shall be equitable: wages, the hours of labor, suitability of the work, all the conditions which are covered by the agreement. We are not concerned at the moment to determine these conditions in any detail: they are often singularly complex; and a fair decision calls for expert knowledge, impartial consideration of many factors, and a resolve to do right to all the interests concerned. We need only remark that human labor is not a mere marketable commodity, of which the price is to be regulated by the law of demand and supply; and that an agreement is not necessarily just because employers or employed are willing to accept it, compelled by a necessity which they are unable to resist. "Let it be taken for granted," Leo XIII. writes, "that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of natural justice more imperious and more ancient than any bargain between man and man that the remuneration must be sufficient to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If, through necessity or fear of greater evil, the workman accepts harder conditions, because an employer or a contractor will give him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice." And, as employers may not take advantage of the workers' need to beat down his reasonable claims, and compel him to accept an insufficient wage, so neither may workers put compulsion on employers, and force terms from them which are unjust.

Justice, too, requires that agreements freely and fairly

entered into shall be faithfully observed. Of course, circumstances may, as they often do, change; an agreement which was equitable once may cease to be so; may now press unduly on the employers or on employed, may justly call for revision. But, even then, a contract is a sacred thing, in which conscience is involved, which, is to be fulfilled in the letter and in the spirit. It may not be cast aside at the mere will of either contracting party. A "lightning" strike may be as dishonest as the laggard indolence which deliberately withholds any portion of the labor for which an adequate wage is asked and received.

#### LAW OF CHARITY.

And, if a sense of justice, governing the attitude of both capital and labor, must make for a better understanding and for social peace, still more must this be the result of our Catholic teaching on the law or principle of Christian charity. "By this shall all men know that you are My disciples, if you have love one for another"; and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Nor is love here a mere feeling of compassion for the poor and suffering which may lead to almsgiving and other works of mercy; it is an abiding benevolence, good-will, towards all mankind. In this sense, Christian employers are commanded by Christ to love their workers, workers to love employers—to wish them no evil, to wish them well. Such love does not involve any renunciation of class or individual rights; we may claim what is justly ours, and insist on receiving it, even from those we love. But, while we urge the claim, we allow ourselves to indulge in no feelings of resentment or of hate. We seek to do no hurt beyond what may be involved in the assertion of our own rights. We are careful to keep our claim within the limits of what is just. We refuse to avail ourselves of methods or of means at variance with God's law or with the calm judgment of honorable men. If Our Lord's Commandment of love were practically acknowledged by employers and by employed, there would be little of class warfare between them, and that little would be waged in a spirit which must lead speedily to peace.

Above all, it would make impossible that temper of

mind and heart which finds expression in so much Socialistic literature, in writings such as James Connolly's "Dying Socialist to his Son," and his "Rebel Song" or "Hymn of Hate." Their declared object is to inflame class against class; not only to vindicate the rights of the workers, but to fill their souls with bitterness and wrath against the rich. They are an absolute repudiation of Our Lord's most emphatic teaching; they are more distinctly anti-Christian than the old Jewish precept: "Thou shalt not pity him, but shalt require life for a life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." You have heard that it hath been said, Christ comments on the passage, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thy enemy." But I say to you: "Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that persecute and calumniate you; that you may be the children of your Father, who is in heaven." What a profound antagonism between the teaching of the Socialist leader and the teaching of Our Lord!

#### LAW OF BROTHERHOOD.

For, so far from leaning approval to the Socialistic theory of class warfare, to the belief, so earnestly fostered by Socialistic writers, that "Class is naturally hostile to class, that rich and poor are intended by nature to live at war with one another," Our Lord and His Apostles persistently lay stress upon the doctrine that all men, particularly Christian men, are brothers. He Himself concludes the parable of the unmerciful servant with the warning: "So also shall My Heavenly Father do to you, if you forgive not everyone his brother, from your hearts." And again: "Whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment." Indeed, His doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God led necessarily to His assertion of the brotherhood of man, as His own Incarnation, and His foundation of the Church, led to a drawing closer of the bonds. For all men are children of the common Father: all men have been redeemed by a common Saviour, who is "the first-born among many brethren"; and all the members of His Church are in a special sense His brethren, and brothers to one another, in the family which He governs. "As long

as you did it to one of these, My least brethren, you did it unto Me." He says, speaking of the judgment; and "Go tell My brethren" He bids the holy women, after His resurrection, in His message to the Disciples. Hence, the Apostles speak habitually of the Faithful as "the brethren," "our brethren," "my brother." "He was seen of above 500 brethren at once," St. Paul writes of an apparition of Our Lord after His resurrection. "We know that we have passed from death to life, because we love the brethren," St. John writes. "Men, brethren," St. Peter addresses the first believers, when they met in the upper room, on returning to Jerusalem from Mount Olivet. And the phrase, with all that it implies, has continued the usual form in which the Church addresses Christians until our own day.

God, therefore, would have men, particularly Christian men, to be brothers, loving one another truly, animated by a spirit of justice towards each other. All men, capitalists and workers, employers and employes, are equally the sons of God, equally Christ's brethren, equally brothers among themselves. No diversity of earthly interests can take from the Divinely appointed ties of kinship, justice, love. And, if men would accept Christ's teachings and shape their lives by them, there would be no hatred of the capitalist, no oppression of the worker, no class warfare between employers and employed. A clash of interests there would still be, of course, from time to time, and a difference of view as to what would be a rightful settlement. But, with workers sharing in the management of industries, with their presence and influence on public boards and in Parliament, with strong Catholic trade unions, with suitable State industries, co-operation, and conciliation boards—all actuated by the Christian spirit of justice, charity, and brotherhood—occasions of strife would become very rare, and, if they did occur, would invariably and promptly yield to the remedies we have been considering. There would be neither class warfare nor constant threatenings of it; as is the case at present.

Marxian Socialism is no cure for social evils; and the Catholic Church has condemned it. Nationalization of all production and distribution has little more of promise

than extreme Socialism itself; but is the object of no authoritative Church teaching, and may be judged of on its merely economic merits. Other measures, like those we have just mentioned, will mitigate, when applied collectively or separately, and even when dissevered from religion, the bitterness of class struggles, and the hurtful consequences that flow from them. But, of themselves, they are unlikely to achieve wide-spread and permanent results. If it be true—and we have seen it is true—that it is impossible, as it would be inexpedient, to reduce all the members of the civil State to one and the same low level of material conditions, if class differences are to exist always, in consequence of inequalities in mental gifts, and bodily energy, and strength of character—then religion alone can give any contentment to the masses, can alone curb envy, and jealousy, and covetousness; which are not to be driven out by arbitration boards and co-operation. Even religion will never free mankind from these and similar defects; for the multitude of men will never accept Gospel teachings as the supreme rule of judgment and of conduct. No efforts will bring back paradise to earth—perfect health of body, joy of mind, peace of conscience, charity between man and man. Nor will any efforts bring forth a civil State in which there shall be no personal inequalities, or class differences, or struggles between those who have least of earth's good things and those who have more. But much may be done to secure justice for the worker, to give dignity and happiness to his life, to lessen the galling contrast between class and class, to mitigate class jealousy and class warfare: much may be done, and much should be attempted, by the human means we have been engaged in considering, especially if reinforced and sanctified by the principles and sanctions of our religion.

## New Women

BLANCHE MARY KELLY, Litt.D.

*From the "International Federation Catholic Alumnae Bulletin."*

THE past hundred years have witnessed, among other phenomena, the widespread development of what is known as the higher education of women, together with complete transformation of women's status in society. Indeed, so complete has this transformation been that its earliest exponents were known to the generation which produced them as "new" women. This newness consisted chiefly in their claim to be the mental equals of men and their intellectual declaration of independence took the form of as close an imitation as possible of everything masculine. There has always seemed to me to be something delightfully feminine in the process of reasoning which saw in this rejection of feminine characteristics a proof of feminine superiority.

But these new women were essentially strong-minded and they prided themselves on having put off the weaknesses of their sex. They regarded themselves as reactions from the type of woman who fainted at the sight of a mouse, whose mind was fed by the fashion papers, who received her daily bread and her political opinions from a husband or father, and her moral code from her religion. As a proof that they possessed brains the new women wore mannish clothes, became wage-earners and demanded a vote. In the course of time the modern feminist was evolved, a woman who regards men not as her peers or her rivals but to a great extent as her enemies, and in her antagonism has emancipated herself from religion as from something "man-made."

Now I have no desire to enter into discussion of the feminist movement nor to defend the hysterics and smelling salts against which the new woman revolted. These remarks are merely preliminary to the reminder that it is possible to be intellectual without ceasing to be womanly. It was possible for "a pale small person scarcely embodied at all," to write sonnets which do not fall far short of Shakespeare, and a large measure of the



success of the French salons of the eighteenth century was due to the feminine grace and charm that were the setting for their hostesses' brilliant wit. It is admitted that many of the excesses of the new women were due to their very newness; the spread of the movement has toned down some extravagances, although at the same time it has produced others.

The fact remains that woman's position today is radically different from what it was even a generation ago. She sits side by side with men in the lecture halls of universities, she competes with them in business, she rivals and sometimes excels them in the professions, and now that in so many States she shares the suffrage with them she is a force to be reckoned with in politics. And all this is the result of higher education.

#### THE CHURCH AND WOMEN.

The only institution that has not changed its attitude toward women is the Catholic Church, and the reason is that there has been no occasion for such a change. In the eyes of the Church the position of woman is what it has always been, a position based on explicit recognition of her intellectual qualifications and moral responsibility. In the eyes of the Church the human race, men and women, consists of so many souls to be brought to salvation, and her educational systems differ from others in this, that they seek to perfect all the faculties of these souls. They recognize truth as the proper object of the intellect of women as well as of men, but they do not endeavor to develop their intellect at the expense of their other faculties. They would not have them *strong-minded* to the detriment of their wills, and they know that there is no more dauntless citadel of courage than a woman's heart.

All through the centuries the Church has provided for the intellectual needs of women. She has relied on their ability to further the spread of God's kingdom, their authority in Divine things is reverently invoked and their achievements are rewarded with the highest of all honors, the honors of the altar.

The countless teaching Orders of women are in themselves sufficient evidence of the Church's solicitude for

women and the impetus given to education in the nineteenth century not only did not find her unprepared but shows her a pioneer in the field. In that century alone upward of forty distinct Orders were founded for the education of girls, all of them subsisting in a flourishing condition today. To speak only of this country, it is less than a century and a quarter since Teresa Lalor opened in Georgetown her "academy for young ladies," and now there are in the United States more than 700 Catholic institutions for the higher education of women.

There was a time when Catholic education was decried as reactionary and even as unnecessary. Those who denied its utility did so on the ground that whereas you might teach philosophy or history from a Catholic standpoint, the exact sciences are outside the range of religion. It may be due to the workings of an unscientific mind, but I shall always feel that mathematics held a spiritual appeal for Pascal and that the experiments of the good Abbot Mendel owed not a little to the co-operation of the Holy Ghost. Besides, the most exact of all sciences is religion.

Those who reproached convents with not turning out women fitted to make what is called their way in the world were requiring them to meet a need before it had arisen. For women have only been making their way in the world since they equipped themselves to compete with men. If they had never entered into such competition, the culture of our mothers and grandmothers, the culture which knew Browning and Tennyson and Thackeray and Dickens but did not so much as dream of Ibsen or Turgenieff or Maeterlinck, would have been sufficient for this world, in which they knew themselves to have no abiding city. Such culture as this was worn with a peculiar grace by the convent girls of other days. Those of today have proved conclusively in many fields of activity that a convent-trained mind is an asset in making one's way through a world in which one is endeavoring to carry unspotted a convent-bred soul.

#### CATHOLIC WOMEN'S VOCATION.

This is the season of commencement and valedictory, of leave-taking and greeting, when a mighty "Hail and Farewell" goes up throughout the land. It is the season

which brings girls in their thousands, not always "with reluctant feet," to the meeting of brook and river, girls but women, too, "new" women, girls for whom school-days are already taking on the glamour of things past, women for whom the future still wears the alluring charm of the uncharted and the unessayed. Every year at this season the doors of convents swing wide to allow hundreds of these new women to take their places in the world, after years spent in the very courts of God, in daily contact with consecrated lives, with characters tempered by religion, breathed upon by the strong winds of faith, exalted by the inspiration of the liturgy, with minds enlightened by the Sacraments and fed upon the daily bread of Truth. They possess the key to the limitless treasures of secular learning, the means of developing their own knowledge, for if they have learned anything it is that education is a continuous process, and that they are in the initial stages of it. They come forth fitted to be in another and higher sense, new women indeed, bringing as they do old and consecrated theories of life to new conditions of living. It lies with them to vindicate the superiority of Catholic education, as the new women of a generation ago, undertook, often by mistaken means, to vindicate education in general. It is their task to permeate the world with this new feminism, which is as old as Mary of Nazareth, its prototype and model. By a courageous modesty of dress, by the balanced sanity of their attitude toward books and plays and pleasures, by their recognition of the dignity of poverty and the responsibilities of wealth, by the unfaltering tenor of a holy scorn in the face of the countless new philosophies and cults, it is for them to continue that final task of the Paraclete, to prove that the prince of this world is already judged.

Many of them will choose one or other of the innumerable careers that now lie open to women, choose it and walk in it with high untarnished souls. A career is an honorable and a creditable possession, but it is well to bear in mind that, when all is said and done, you cannot hear it its prayers or tuck it into bed at night. Many of them will remember the beauty of God's house and return to carry on the tradition of a Teresa Lalor, an Elizabeth

Seton, a Philippine Duchesne. The vast majority of them will choose the ancient calling of home-making and home-keeping and it is especially for them to prove that for knowing political economy a woman is not less fitted to look to the ways of her house, nor for knowing Greek to be the mother of children. Above all, it is for all of us, new women and old, to remember that learning alone is a barren and empty thing. It is for us to remember that great truth which long ago Brother Giles shouted to the world from the wall of a convent garden: "An old woman who has never learned anything and cannot read can love God more than Brother Bonaventure!"

## **"Send Your Children to Catholic Schools"**

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND.

**H**OW shall that building be filled in the future?" asked a non-Catholic, looking at the Cathedral in St. John. A companion, also a non-Catholic, found the answer. "See the splendid Catholic school near the Cathedral," he said, "it provides that, that pews in the Cathedral will be filled in the future. Archbishop Ireland, who related this little story, in a small parish, told of the sources that maintained the parish school. "Whence is it that we have been able to build our superb schools and colleges?" he asked. "I gave the reply. They are the fruits of Catholic self-denial.

"There is the self-denial of parents, who, from their scanty earnings, are willing to set aside the money needed to build school houses and to defray therein the expenses of the education of their children. There is the self-denial of priests, Brothers and Sisters, who work without thought of worldly remuneration, giving themselves in utter oblation to the cause of Christian education, because that cause is the cause of the Church of God.

"For aid to the priests, to Brothers, to Sisters in their magnificent work of Christian education, I call on every Catholic to make their work his own work, to value that work as the highest charity. In the Catholic parish

school there is a remedy for the evil that is sapping the nation's strength." Archbishop Ireland referred to it in this exhortation, which every Catholic parent should read:

"Let us speak the patent fact. As the effect of the exclusion of religion from schools in America, America with all its material progress, is on the road to what at best is cultured paganism. God and Christ are being crushed out of the lives of its citizens, because God and Christ are being crushed out from the school rooms into which are thrust the childhood and the youth of the land.

"Then, if you wish that your men and women of the future be valiant Catholics, put your children into Catholic schools; help to maintain and develop those schools. The Church knows well its needs; it pauses before no effort, before no sacrifice, to bring to all its little ones a Catholic education. Catholic parents, send your little ones to Catholic schools. Catholics all, take deepest interest in the work of Catholic education, whether or not your children are its immediate beneficiaries.

"It is the Church that makes the appeal, for her own sake, for her own life, for her own welfare. Let us care for the Catholic children of today; the morrow of the Church will be provided for in America. Let us not neglect Catholic education. If we do, the future of the Church in America is to be despaired of."